DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 361 CG 015 967

AUTHOR Neel, Robert; And Others
TITLE Relationships between Personality Characteristics and Leadership Styles at Different Supervisory Levels.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association (52nd, New York, NY, April 22-25, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Comparative Analysis; *Cultural Influences; Extended Family; Foreign Countries; Interpersonal Relationship; *Leadership Styles; *Middle Management; Organizational Climate; *Personality Traits; *Power Structure; Predictor Variables; *Supervisory Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Turkey

ABSTRACT

The primary focus of organization in Turkish society has been the extended family, with an emphasis on family loyalty and an extremely centralized authority. To study the relationships among levels of supervision in relation to personality and cultural influence, 69 subjects (foremen and department heads) were drawn from three small Turkish industries. Several measures of personality and leadership style were applied. In addition each man was rated by his immediate supervisor. Results showed that the department head set the general style of supervision for all those below him regardless of personality, suggesting that the department head obtains his leadership style primarily from the managers above him. These findings are consistent with Turkish culture, in contrast to American culture in which an individual's leadership style arises from a combination of the style of those above him and his own personality. (JAC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217361

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND LEADERSHIP STYLES AT DIFFERENT SUPERVISORY LEVELS

Robert Neel and Oliver Tzeng

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

and

E. Tekarslan and C. Baysal

Istanbul University

CG 015967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Neel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The purpose of this study was to see if personality characteristics could be used to predict leadership styles in a developing country (Turkey) and to study the relationships among levels of supervision in relationship to personality and cultural influence as suggested by Bradburn (1963).

"The primary focus of organization in Turkish society has been the extended family with a tight family group characterized by strong emphasis on family loyalty....Interviews with Turkish businessmen afforded a picture of the father as an authoritarian figure who made all decisions regarding the family without consulting other members of the family. Almost universally, these men described their fathers as stern, forbidding, remote, ddomineering and autocratic....Most of the men, however, reported that even though their fathers were authoritarian and had been very stern with them when they were growing up, the remoteness was tempered with considerable expression of affection....In view of the close-knit family organization typical of Turkey, we would expect...(to) find the organization broken down into little sub-families with the relationship of the employees being one of extreme dependence on their immediate supervisors...."This dependence is manifested in highly personalized relationships involving self-manipulation and an emphasis on pleasing one's superiors through deference and loyality rather than through objective job performance (Presthus and Ari, 1955)....This emphasis on dependence in the superior-subordinate relationship is analogous to the father-son relationship."

"Another feature of Turkish family organization, which is mirrored in management practices, is the extremely centralized nature of authority. Like the father in the family, the owner or general manager of a firm typically makes all the decisions relating to the operations of the firm, even routine or minor ones, handing them down from above with little prior consultation with those who may be involved in carrying them out and very little feedback from the members of the management staff....Even in firms that are so large that it is physically impossible for one man to handle everything, there is a tendency to keep the number of those with the "power of signature," the symbol of authority, to

a minimum and to refer routine matters upward for approval. The subordinate does not expect to be asked his opinion on the matter at hand and, indeed, would probably be so surprised if he were asked that he would be at a loss to reply.

This deferential behavior is very specific to the superior-subordinate relationship; the junior manager, who is self-effacing in the presence of his superior, may by authoritian in turn with his subordinates. In interpersonal behavior outside the superior-subordinate relationship a person may be extremely polite and formal in line with general standards of etiquette, but he will act with a certain dignity and self-esteem that he appears to lack in the presence of someone who is recognized as a superior."

Subjects were drawn from three small Turkish industries. Subjects included 36 first-line foreman, 27 general foremen, and 6 department heads. These subjects are in direct subordinate-supervisor relationships at their hierarchical levels. One of the unique situations of these subjects is the relatively low education level of all supervisors. The first-line supervisors have no more than an eighth-grade education and frequently less; the second-level supervisors generally have a less than a 12th-grade education; and department heads vary from high school to some college. Most workers are functionally illiterate. Workers and first-line supervisors are usually recent immigrants to the urban area from rural Turkey.

Measures

Four types of scales were used in this study. (1) A short form of the F-Scale for measuring each subject's authoritarian personality characteristics; (2) Frew's (1977) Leadership Style Scale for measuring self reported style of supervision (from very autocratic to very democratic); (3) Frew's (1977) Followership Style Scale for identifying each subject's desired leadership style (authoritarian or democratic) of his leader; (4) a supervisory-style appraisal form developed by the first author for measuring the perceived supervisory characteristics of each subject by his immediate supervisor. A high score on the remaining three scales indicates a democratic leadership style. All measures were

translated into Turkish and translated back into English for verification of the measurement constructs in these scales. While the first three measures were administered to all subjects in many small groups, with explanations of the questionaires by Turkish-speaking, native scholars, the fourth measure (perceived supervisory characteristics) of the first-line foremen and general foremen was provided by their respective immediate supervisors.

Analysis and Result

The bases for data analyses are mean scores of each individual on all measures. The results from these separate analyses are as follows: (a) intra-level correlations for each of the three supervisory levels were computed as were the inter-level correlations between first line foremen and general foremen, and department heads, thus necessitating some degree of duplication in the general foreman and department head (i.e. personal characteristics and self-reported, perceived and desired leadership styles). First line supervisors showed one significant correlation (r=.41) between Followership Profile and leadership style. The results of all other intra-level correlations are given in tables 1 and 2.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 about here

Among the inter-correlations, only three are significant beyond the .01 level and the rest are non-significant. These results suggest two important phenomena: (1) two aspects of leadership styles of these general foremen--self-reported styles and supervisor's perception of their styles are significantly related to each other and are congruent with the general foreman's personality, indicating the consistent practice of their leadedship in the working environment; (2) the desired leadership style (on the Followership Style Scale) indicates the diversity of these forenen in preference to their own supervisors' leadership styles in working.

Table 2 shows the inverse relationship between personality and leadership style of the department heads. It also shows the department heads' ideal supervisor (followership style) correlates significantly with their own leadership style. To further investigate the nature of such a potential conflict between levels, inter-level analyses were conducted as follows: (b) inter-level analysis. Table 3 presents the coefficients of inter-relationships between three leadership style measures of the general foremen and the department heads' personality characteristics and two leadedship style measures. It is interesting to note that there exist three clusters of coefficients in the table.

Insert Table 3 about here

Cluster one includes the positive correlations of department head self-reported leadership style with all three leadership measures of their subordinates, the general foremen. This result indicates the consistency of leadership styles across two levels of supervisors in Turkey industries. Cluster two includes two negative correlations between two levels. Department head personality characteristics are in conflict with their subordinates' own leadership practice. The third cluster indicates non-significant correlations of the desired leadership styles with either the self-reported leadership practice or the perceived leadership practice.

The present inter-level analysis clearly suggests two important phenomena: (1) inter-level congruence in the practice of leadership and supervision, and (2) inter-level conflicts between the personality characteristics of the department head level and the personality of their subordinates, the general foremen. The general foremen show a positive correlation between personality and leadership style whereas the department head shows a negative correlation between leadership style and personality. Leadership style, however, is authoritative in both cases. These phenomena suggest the necessity of a cross-level analysis on all measures. This means that the practices and personality of

department heads are congruent (authoritarian personality and authoritative supervisory styles), as are the personality and leadership styles of the general foremen. Leadership style and followership style within first-level foremen and supervisory ratings are all democratic. The followership style of the general foremen is the same as the leadership style of the department heads. Leadership style and supervisory ratings are the same for the general foremen. (c) Tri-level analysis. The composite scores of the three subject levels on different measures were correlated, yielding a 10 x 10 correlation matrix for the 10 level-by-measure variables. Within these measures, one is the indicator of perceived similarity of leadership styles between the second and third level supervisors (rated by department heads). Factor analysis of this correlation matrix yielded four distinct factors that accounted for over 78% of the total variance. The rotated factor matrix via varimax criterion is given in Table 4.

Insert Table 5 about here

Factor one represents the deparment heads' general influence in style, setting, and personality. Factor two represents the general foremen's influence on the first-line foremen. Factor three represents the personality and leadership style of the first-line foremen. Factor four represents the interpersonal conflicts among them.

In conclusion we can say that the department head sets the general style of supervision for all those below him regardless of personality. It is probable that the department head obtains his leadership style primarily from the managers above him. This is consistent with the Turkish culture, in contrast to the American who obtains his leadership style from a combination of the style of those above him and his own personality.

Table 1

General Foreman

	F-scale	Leadership Style	Supervisor's Ratings
F-scale			
Leadership Style			
Supervisor's Ratings	.44	.49	
Followership Style			-.60

significant at .01 level.

Table 2

Department Head

	F-Scale	Leadership Style
F-Scale		
Leadership Style	.63	
Supervisor's Ratings	.44	
Followership Style		.56

Table 3

General Foreman and Department Head

		General Foreman		
		F-scale	Leadership Style	Supervisor's Ratings
Department Head	F-scale		.61	
	Leadership Style	-.33	.55	.57
	Supervisor's Ratings		.49	
	Followership Style	-.43	.36	

significant at .05 level.

Table 4

	Leadership Style		Personality	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Department Head	2.96	3.00	3.63	3.60
General Foreman	2.89	2.85	3.68	3.90
Line Foreman	2.88	2.95	3.47	3.55

Table 5

ROTATED FACTOR MATRIX AMONG 13 LEVEL-BY-MEASURE VARIABLES

Level	Measure	Factors			
		I	II	III	IV
	F-scale	-.83*	.10	.11	.12
1	Leadership Style	-.80*	.10	-.32*	-.12
	Followership Style	-.37*	.06	-.75*	-.18
	Supervisors Rating	-.63	.02	-.05	-.66*
	F-Scale	.07	-.21	.79*	-.01
2	Leadership Style	-.79*	-.03	-.09	.22
	Followership Style	.33*	.17	-.06	.68*
	Supervisors Ratings	.22	-.39*	-.14	-.62*
	F-scale	-.27	.42*	.59*	-.25
3	Leadership Style	.24	.67*	-.07	.19
	Followership Style	-.15	.82*	-.10	.02

* Indicates salient loadings

Footnote

1) The pilot project for this research was conducted by an Istambul University practicum in industrial research class.

References

Adorno, T., Frankel-Brunswich, E., Levinson, P., and Sanford, R. The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper, 1950

Bradburn, N., "Interpersonal relations within formal organizations in Turkey," The Journal of Social Issues, January, 1963, Vol. XIX No. 1.

Frew,D.R., "Leadership and followership," Personnel Journal, February, 1977, 90-97.

Lzettin, K., "A cross-cultural study of personality and leadership," Group and Organizational Studies, March, 1977.

Neel, R., and Dunn, R. "Predicting success in supervisors' training programs by the use of psychological tests," Journal of Applied Psychology, 1960, 44.

Presthus, R.V., and Ari, O., "An administrative study of Erigli Komusleri Isletmesi," Ankara: Public Administration Institute for Turkey and the Middle East, 1955 (mimeo).